

REMARKS

The Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

The rejections under section 112 are moot in view of the amendments to the claims.

The Rejections Under 35 USC § 102 and 103

There is not even a generic overlap with the compounds of WO '211. See, e.g., the definition of R¹ and R², and no compounds of the claims are taught or suggested at all by WO '211. As such, both the sections 102 and 103 rejections over this reference are moot.

The compounds of Reiter et al. are not within the scope of the present claims. See, e.g., the definition of R². As such, the sections 102 rejection over this reference is moot.

There is not even a generic overlap with the compounds of DE '181. See, e.g., the definition of R¹ and R² (R⁴ and R⁵, respectively in DE '181), and also the preferred groups identified, e.g., at the top of page 3 of DE '181 as well as the examples, leading away from the compounds of the present claims. No compounds of the claims are taught or suggested at all by this reference. As such, the section 103 rejection over DE '181 is moot.

Double Patenting Rejection

This rejection is moot in view of the amendments to the claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, VA 22201
Telephone: 703-243-6333
Facsimile: 703-243-6410
Attorney Docket No.: MERCK-3188

Date: September 17, 2009